

## REMARKS

Claims 1-21 remain in the present application. Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15 and 18 are amended herein. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added as a result of the Claim amendments. Applicant respectfully requests further examination and reconsideration of the rejections based on the arguments set forth below.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 4, 11 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 4, 11 and 18, as amended herein, comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, thereby overcoming the rejections of record.

### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent Application Number 2001/0049672 by Moore et al. (hereafter referred to as "Moore"). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are not anticipated by Moore for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner to independent Claim 1 that recites a method of updating Web pages of an e-commerce storefront comprising (emphasis added):

accessing a Web page out of a plurality of Web pages of an e-commerce Web site;  
submitting log in information to the Web site, wherein said log in information is for providing privileges sufficient to enable editing of the

Web site, and wherein said log in information is provided over an intranet link;

- invoking a web page editor having a graphical user interface for editing the Web page;
- selecting an item on the Web page to modify;
- editing the item on the Web page;
- submitting the edited item to the Web site; and
- receiving an updated version of the Web page to view and verify the edited item.

Independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar to independent Claim 1.

Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that Moore fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said log in information is provided over an intranet link" as recited in independent Claim 1. As recited and described in the present application, log in information is submitted over an intranet link (e.g., 131 as shown in Figure 1 of the present application).

In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicant fails to find any teaching or suggestion of submitting log in information over an intranet link as claimed. Although Moore may teach that a merchant supplies a user ID and a password (paragraph 62), Applicants fail to find any teaching or suggestion in Moore of submitting such information over an intranet link as claimed. Accordingly, Applicants reiterate that Moore fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said log in information is provided over an intranet link" as recited in independent Claim 1.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that independent Claim 1 is not anticipated by Moore, thereby overcoming the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Since independent Claims 8 and 15 recite limitations similar

to independent Claim 1, independent Claims 8 and 15 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Since Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 2, 4-5, 9-12, 16 and 18-19 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 11-12, 15-16 and 18-19 are allowable.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

##### Claims 3, 10 and 17

Claims 3, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Moore. Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 3, 10 and 17 are not rendered obvious by Moore since independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable for the previously-discussed reasons, and Claims 3, 10 and 17 depend from their respective independent Claims and recite further limitations to the claimed invention. Thus, Claims 3, 10 and 17 overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of record, and are therefore allowable.

##### Claims 6, 13 and 20

Claims 6, 13 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Moore in view of United States Patent Number 6,785,721 to Immerman et al. (hereafter referred to as "Immerman"). Applicant has reviewed the cited reference and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 6, 13 and 20 are not rendered obvious by Moore in view of Immerman for the following reasons.

Pages 4 and 5 of the rejection state that Moore fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page," "submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page," and "wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level" as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 13 and 20. Applicant concurs.

Additionally, Applicant respectfully submits that Immerman, either alone or in combination with Moore, fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "submitting a first log in information to obtain a first privilege level for editing the Web page," "submitting a second log in information to obtain a second privilege level for editing the Web page," and "wherein the second privilege level is higher than the first privilege level for modifying a greater number of items of the Web page than the first privilege level" as recited in Claim 6, and similarly recited in Claims 13 and 20. In contrast to the claimed embodiments, Applicants understands Immerman to merely teach an access control list that specifies that level of access that users and servers have to a database (line 66 of col. 19 to line 1 of col. 20). However, this does not amount to a teaching of submitting log in information to obtain a privilege level *for editing a web page* as claimed. Further, Immerman fails to teach or suggest a first and second privilege level each enabling the editing of a different number of items of the web page as claimed.

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that that Immerman, either alone or in combination with Moore, fails to cure the deficiencies of Moore discussed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Immerman also fails to

teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said log in information is provided over an intranet link" as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Since Claims 6, 13 and 20 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 6, 13 and 20 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 6, 13 and 20 are allowable.

#### Claims 7, 14 and 21

Claims 7, 14 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being rendered obvious by Moore in view of United States Patent Number 6,643,663 to Dabney et al. (hereafter referred to as "Dabney"). Applicant has reviewed the cited references and respectfully submits that the embodiments of the present invention as recited in Claims 7, 14 and 21 are not rendered obvious by Moore in view of Dabney for the following reasons.

Applicant respectfully submits that that Dabney, either alone or in combination with Moore, fails to cure the deficiencies of Moore discussed above. Specifically, Applicant respectfully submits that Dabney also fails to teach or suggest the limitations of "wherein said log in information is provided over an intranet link" as recited in independent Claims 1, 8 and 15. Since Claims 7, 14 and 21 depend from and recite further limitations to the invention claimed in their respective independent Claims, Claims 7, 14 and 21 also overcome the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of record. Therefore, Claims 7, 14 and 21 are allowable.

### CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1-21 are in condition for allowance and Applicant earnestly solicits such action from the Examiner.

The Examiner is urged to contact Applicant's undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present Application.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 2/19, 2008

Bmf

Bryan M. Failing  
Registration No. 57,974

Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, CA 95113  
(408) 938-9060